



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

and -culum) has called attention to the fact that a no small number of such nouns denote the result of the action, as well as the instrument, or the action, as is the case with *fragmentum*, *caementum*, *ramentum*, *detrimentum*; and the *Thesaurus* has two instances of *crementum* = "offspring."

There is a passage in the *Digest* (33, 8, 8, cited from Ulpian) which may give a clue to the way the concrete meaning "offspring" arose: "*incrementa* ex rebus peculiaribus . . . ut puta *partus* ancillarum, vel *fetus* pecorum," i.e., the *incrementa* are the offspring of slave women and cattle. From this usage, which obviously belonged to the early agricultural days of Rome, it is not difficult to imagine how in peasant-language the word acquired a specialized meaning of human offspring in general—and Servius testifies to the fact that Vergil's usage was suited to bucolic diction.

It seems then that we need not strain the root meaning of *incrementum* into far-fetched interpretations of the two passages cited. The poet of the *Ciris*—very possibly the youthful Vergil—was enough of an Alexandrian to use a word better known in the cottage than in the palace, and probably *doctus* enough to recognize the equivalence of *Διὸς κοῦροι* and Jovis incrementum in the sense of offspring of Jove. In the Eclogue, Vergil repeated the line as he so often did, and in the same simple sense, but applying it to a child of the *praesens divus*. The fact that the second half of the line is then almost a repetition of the sense of the first half need hardly disturb anyone who knows Vergil's fondness for parallelism in sentiment.

This note does not add decisive evidence upon any of the important questions relating to the fourth Eclogue, but if *incrementum* means offspring I am inclined to think that the child referred to was the expected child of Augustus, and furthermore that the line in the Eclogue was written subsequent to the *Ciris*.

TENNEY FRANK

BYRN MAWR COLLEGE

UDAS ANTE FORES: *Persius* v. 165-66

In the fifth satire of Persius, 166-74, the exclusion scene in the Eunuchus of Terence, Act I, scene 1, is used following the precedent of Horace *Sat.* ii. 3. 259-71 as a stock example of the slavery to love. The lines 162-66 read as follows:

crudum Chaerestratus unguem
adrodens ait haec—an siccis dedecus obstem
cognatis? An rem patriam rumore sinistro
limen ad obscaenum frangam, dum Chrysidis udas
ebrius ante fores exstincta cum face canto?

Here the phrase *udas ante fores* is, as Gildersleeve characteristically remarks, "wet with the sweat of the commentators of Persius."

Before taking up the current interpretations of the phrase it is essential to notice that all recent editors regard these lines as an allusion to a *παράκλανσιθυρον*. At first sight this interpretation in view of *canto* seems the

only natural one. Thus Gildersleeve: "Antique erotic literature is full of the caterwaulings of excluded lovers." The best-known examples of this genre in Latin literature are Tibullus 1, 2; Propertius 1, 16; Horace *Carm.* iii. 10; Ovid *Amores* i. 6. The essential procedure of the excluded lover is also sketched in Lucretius iv. 1179 ff.; Catullus 63, 65; Horace *Epodes* xi. 19-22; Ovid *Metam.* xiv. 709; *Ars Am.* ii. 237.

We find the commentators, following the variant details of such scenes, interpreting *udas* as: (1) wet with unguents (cf. Lucretius iv. 1179 ff.); (2) with wine (Gildersleeve who compares Horace *Carm.* i. 7. 22); (3) with tears (Propertius i. 16. 4); Ovid *Am.* 1. 6. 18; (4) with rain (Tibullus i. 2. 31-32); Horace *Carm.* iii. 10, 19-20; Ovid *Ars Am.* ii. 237.¹

Thus the modern editors, though differing as to the precise interpretation of *udas*, are all united in regarding the scene as one wholly painted in the pathetic colors of erotic poetry. I believe this view is misleading. The existence of a parallel scene in the satiric-comic tradition has been obscured. The whole context, however, shows that the allusion to the lover's strain (*canto*) is presented from the point of view of New Comedy and satire, though doubtless the comic scene was not uninfluenced by the more fully formulated scenes of erotic literature, and may even have taken its *genesis* from them. Thus our whole passage is a working over of the *Eunuchus*, Act I, scene 1. Persius uses the scene following the Horatian precedent of satire, ii. 3, 259-71, just as Horace probably was influenced by Lucilius' use of the scene in a satire in book xvii, fragments 729, 737, 731, 735. The lover is represented in Menander, Lucilius, Horace, Persius as an absolute slave to the fickle whims of his mistress, and as such held up to ridicule. Cicero's *Paradoxa Stoicorum* v. 36 gives the essential features of such scenes—the inconsistency and irrationality of the feminine rule to which masculine reason is in slavish subjection.

Such is the general setting of the passage, but the key to the meaning of the phrase *udas ante fores* is found rather in two other passages in Lucilius and Horace. Lucilius xxix, 2 fragments 837, 839, 840, 843, 844, 845, elaborates upon the attempt of the excluded lover to break into the house with his slave and the defense of the occupants. In 841 and 845 we have the particular turn which gives the key to the interpretation of the passage of Persius. Thus in 841:

. . . u . . . u has fenestris in caput
deiciunt qui prope ad ostium aspiraverint.

That the allusion is to a deluge of water² poured upon the lover from the windows becomes clear from a comparison with 845 and the Horatian passage. 845 reads:

Gnato, quid actum est? depilati omnes sumus.

¹ Of recent editors of Persius, Ramorino says unguents and tears, Albini adds water (?) to these two. Némethy and Van Wageningen say rain.

² *Has* perhaps refers to some such word *ollas*; cf. Marx comment *ad loc*; also Juvenal iii. 376 ff.

Here the commentary of Marx rightly explains the *depilati* as referring to the use of hot water in the process of plucking fowls. Cf. Apicius vi. 221. We have precisely the same scene in Horace *Sat.* ii. 7, 88-91:

potesne
ex his ut proprium quid noscere? quinque talenta
poscit te mulier, vexat foribusque repulsum
perfundit gelida, rursus vocat. eripe turpi
colla iugo, "liber, liber sum." dic age.

Since, therefore, I have shown the existence in the satiric tradition of Lucilius and Horace of a scene in which hot or cold water is poured upon the head of the excluded lover, it seems probable that this is the explanation of the phrase *udas ante fores* in Persius.

GEORGE CONVERSE FISKE

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

NOTE ON STOBAEUS *Eclog.* II. 104. 6 W

Εἶναι δὲ καὶ ἀχάριστον, οὔτε πρὸς ἀνταπόδοσιν χάριτος οἰκείως ἔχοντα οὔτε πρὸς μετάδοσιν διὰ τὸ μῆτε κοινῶς τι ποιεῖν μῆτε φιλικῶς μὴτ' ἀμελετήτως.

The fool as contrasted with the wise man is incapable of *χάρις* because he can do nothing generously, in friendly wise, or—with neglect of preparation and training. This is obviously impossible. The third negatived adverb must, like the other two, designate a good quality denied to the fool. Wachsmuth's apparatus records various unsatisfactory conjectures: ἀμελλήτως vel μελετήτως Heeren, εὐμελετήτως Gaisford, τημελήτως Meineke. The true reading is, I think, ἀμεταμελήτως, "without repenting." That the fool always repents and the wise man never, is common doctrine from Plato (*Rep.* 577E) to William Morris. It is also Stoic doctrine; cf. Stobaeus *Eclogue* ii. 113. 5: οὐδὲ μετανοεῖν δ' ὑπολαμβάνουσι τὸν νοῦν ἔχοντα; 102. 22, ὁ δὲ φαῦλος . . . εὐμετάπτωτος ὦν καὶ παρ' ἑκάστα μεταμελεία συνεχόμενος; Seneca *De beneficiis* iv. 34: "Non mutat sapiens consilium . . . ideo numquam illum poenitentia subit."

PAUL SHOREY

WAS ARRIAN GOVERNOR OF SYRIA?

The information available about the official career of Arrian, the historian whose chief work is the principal source for the history of Alexander the great, ends with the year 137, in which he left his position as governor of Cappadocia. In 147-148 he is found as archon at Athens; but it is not known whether during the previous ten years he remained in government service or not.¹ It does not seem at all probable, however, that Hadrian would have put an end to his career after his great service in driving back a barbarian invasion of the province. It is much more probable that Hadrian would have rewarded him with higher office.

¹ Pauly-Wissowa II, 1230 ff.; *Prosop.*, I. 243; *IGR*, III, 111; *CIL*, X, 6006.